

Organizational commitment within a contemporary career context

Abstract

Purpose: This paper analyzes the relation between the underlying dimensions of protean (self direction and values driven) and boundaryless (boundaryless mindset and organizational mobility preference) career attitudes (Briscoe et al., 2006) and organizational commitment, within today's unstable and uncertain business scenario.

Design/methodology/approach: Data was collected from 167 professionals attending graduate and post-graduate distance learning courses. The hypotheses were tested using hierarchical regression analysis.

Findings: Research results suggest that protean career attitudes contribute significantly to individuals' emotional attachment to their employing organization. Furthermore, organizational mobility preference was found to be significant in predicting both affective and continuance commitment.

Research limitations: First, cross-sectional correlational designs impede conclusive inferences regarding causal relationships among the variables. Second, the use of a sample of professionals attending distance learning business courses could limit the generalizability of the study findings, because the majority of the respondents were homogenous in terms of age and educational background.

Practical implications: Fostering individuals' self-direction results in enhanced affective commitment to their employing organizations. Workshops oriented at clarifying and communicating organizational values, philosophy and principles can be all beneficial for strengthening employees' commitment to the organization.

Originality/value: This is the first paper to test the relationship between boundaryless and protean career attitudes and organizational commitment on a European sample.

Keywords: organizational commitment; contemporary careers

Introduction

Economic and financial circumstances of today's unstable and dynamic organizational context explain some of the shift away from the traditional employment arrangements and the established work environment, within the context of an increasingly transactional psychological contract with employees (Rousseau, 1989; Rousseau & Wade-Benzoni, 1995). In response to rapid technological advancements and increased competitive pressures, organizations have started to downsize and to adopt flatter and leaner structures (Sullivan, 1999). In the light of organizational restructuring, companies are not able to offer long-term stability and progressive careers and as a consequence, they increasingly rely on the use of

contingent employees (part-time, temporary and contract help) with short-term employment contracts that supplement a small, permanent work force (Feldman & Ng, 2007). In this context, a growing consensus recognizes that traditional orderly and hierarchical careers are increasingly losing ground to new career conceptualizations, such as boundaryless and protean perspectives, which better capture the realities of a changing scenario (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996; Bridges, 1995; Golzen and Garner, 1990; Handy, 1994; Herriot and Pemberton, 1995; Waterman, Waterman, and Collard, 1994; Baruch, 1999). These two perspectives suggest that the individuals become the sculptors of their own careers (Bell and Staw, 1989), which are less bounded to a single employment setting (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996). In spite of some constructive critiques (e.g. Zeitz, Blau and Fertig, 2009), the idea of “boundaryless careers” has garnered increasing interest in United States, as well as in the European countries (Dany, 2003; Pang 2003; Ackah and Heaton, 2004; Guest 2004). However, there are very few studies in the Spanish context centred on the aspects of the new careers. However, this issue is particularly important in the Spanish context, because as McKeown (2003) remarks while non-standard career arrangements constitute the fastest growing workforce within the industrialized world, Spain stands out among OECD nations as the first in its use of such labor (ABS, 1998).

Researchers have argued that new realities of the current economy, among which changes in psychological contracts (Rousseau, 1989; Rousseau and Wade-Benzoni, 1995) and in the nature of the workforce (Feldman & Ng, 2007) together with a diminished sense of job security (Cappelli, 1999), require a further re-examination of the organizational commitment concept (Baruch, 1998), as commitment cannot be viewed in the same way as it was when employees could expect to spend their entire career with a single company (Meyer, Allen, and Topolnytsky, 1998). While under the transactional contract, workers exchanged loyalty and commitment for job security, under the relational contract, workers exchange performance for continuous learning, marketability and future employability (Mirvis and Hall, 1996; Rousseau, 1989; Rousseau and Wade-Benzoni, 1995). It has been noted that organizational commitment is losing relevance, in the favour of career commitment and job satisfaction, as individuals pursue more emotionally satisfying lives through the discover of their *vocatus* (Gratton and Ghoshal, 2003). As organizations can no longer promise life-time employment and individuals increasingly experience inter-organizational mobility, is organizational commitment no longer related to new career orientations?

This study attempts to examine the extent to which protean and boundaryless career attitudes, encompassing self-direction, predisposition to make choices based on personal values, openness to the exterior and individual inclination to organizational mobility (Briscoe, Hall, and DeMuth, 2006) affect organizational commitment mindsets reflecting desire (affective commitment) and perceived cost of leaving (continuance commitment), drawing on a sample of 167 Spanish professionals.

Boundaryless and protean careers and their corresponding attitudes

Until recently the majority of the empirical research on careers presumed environmental stability and emphasized the objective perspective on careers that prevailed over the subjective one (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996). In this context, traditional career models were conceived as linear progression in one or two companies and evolving through a series of interconnected stages for climbing the organizational ladder (Levinson, 1978; Super, 1957). However, during the last decades, researchers (Arthur, Inkson, and Pringle, 1999; Arthur and Rousseau, 1996; Hall, 2002; Sullivan, 1999; Sullivan and Arthur, 2006) have argued that in response to substantial changes induced by today's unstable and hypercompetitive knowledge driven context, careers increasingly become more boundaryless (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996) and individuals develop protean mindsets (Hall, 1976, 2002) for successfully navigating the current business scenario. As opposed to the paternalistic perspective that characterized traditional careers, boundaryless and protean orientations emphasize the active role of the individuals in managing their own careers and professional development, for enhancing opportunities for continuous learning, future marketability and psychologically meaningful work.

A boundaryless career is viewed as "independent from, rather than dependent on, traditional career arrangements" (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996:6), as it transcends the boundaries of a single employment setting. In spite of the fact that some authors have approached boundaryless careers uniquely considering physical changes in work arrangements (Jones, 1996; Saxenian, 1996), Sullivan and Arthur (2006) emphasize the complexity of the boundaryless career concept and, thus, the need of viewing mobility as measured along two continua (physical and psychological), in order to fully capture the meaning of career boundarylessness. In an extensive review of the empirical research conducted on the changing nature of careers, Sullivan (1999) asserted that the majority of studies examined mobility across physical boundaries, while neglecting psychological mobility and its relationship with physical mobility. In that sense, the physical mobility prevailed over the psychological one mainly due to the difficulty arisen when measuring individuals' perceptions of their capacity to make transitions (Sullivan and Arthur, 2006).

Recognizing that a boundaryless career attitude is primarily psychological, Briscoe, Hall and DeMuth (2006) provided empirical evidence, supporting for the existence of two boundaryless career attitudes: boundaryless mindset (BM) and organizational mobility preference (OMP). Briscoe et al. (2006) defined a boundaryless mindset as a general attitude of transcending organizational boundaries, by feeling comfortable in interacting with people from different organizations and seeking out opportunities for experiencing new situations that result beneficial for the individual (e.g. providing the opportunity to enhance knowledge and skills).

Organizational mobility preference, on the other hand, refers to the strength of interest in remaining with a single or multiple employer(s) (Briscoe et al., 2006). Thus, it is concerned with one's preference for job security, predictability and long-term employment arrangements.

Researchers and practitioners have argued that successful navigation of the current scenario requires the development of a distinct mindset, called protean orientation (Hall, 1976, 2002; Hall, 2004). Within the context of a protean career, individuals, rather than their employing organizations, become the architects of their own careers, development and vocational destiny. This orientation represents an internally driven and self-directed perspective in managing one's career that reflects values such as freedom and adaptability (Hall, 1976, 2002). Similarly, a protean career was described as a contract with oneself, rather than with the organization, as individuals take active responsibility in managing their careers and transforming their career path (Baruch, 2004). Thus, the hallmarks of a protean orientation are: freedom and growth, professional commitment, the attainment of psychological success, through the pursuit of meaningful work and the discovery of a "calling" (Hall, 2004; Hall and Chandler, 2005). Moreover, it has been argued that taking responsibility for managing one's career development can deliver positive psychological outcomes, including career and life satisfaction, enhanced self-efficacy and well-being, as well as extrinsic career progression if desired career outcomes are achieved (Crant, 2000; King, 2004; Seibert, Kraimer, and Crant, 2001).

Briscoe et al. (2006) identified two protean-career relevant attitudes: self-directed career attitudes (SD) and values-driven predispositions (VD), and developed scales for measuring them. As they remarked, a self-directed person takes an independent and proactive role in managing his or her vocational behaviour, while individuals who hold values-driven attitudes rely on their own values, instead of borrowing external standards, when making career choices.

The main focus of this study is to explore the relationship between boundaryless and protean career attitudes and individuals' affective and continuance commitment to their employing organizations. Establishing a relationship between protean and boundaryless career attitudes and organizational commitment would enable determining behavioural consequences of the different career attitudes, as commitment has been identified as one of the most salient predictors of turnover, organizational citizenship behaviour, performance and attendance (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, and Jackson, 1989; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky, 2002; Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982a; Shore and Wayne, 1993). Moreover, in a context in which organizations are striving for winning the war for talent, fostering organizational commitment of key employees is essential for gaining and sustaining competitive advantages.

Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment has been defined as “a force that binds an individual to a course of action that is of relevance to one or more targets” (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001:301). It has been argued that this force is experienced as a mindset that can take different forms, thus reflecting distinguishable components of the underlying commitment construct. Meyer and Allen (1991) developed a multidimensional model of organizational commitment, including three different mindsets: desire to remain in the organization (affective commitment), obligation to remain (normative commitment) and perceived cost of leaving (continuance commitment). This model has been subjected to the greatest empirical scrutiny and has arguably received greatest support (see Meyer et al. (1997) and Meyer et al. (2002) for reviews). From among these components, affective commitment (AC) and continuance commitment (CC) were chosen as the focus of this study because they are most distinguishable from each other (Meyer et al., 2002). Normative commitment (NC) has been left aside because affective and normative commitments have not been as empirically differentiated as theoretically expected (Bergman, 2006). Meyer et al.’s (2002) meta-analysis found that affective and normative commitment are so highly correlated that their distinguishability is in question. These two components were found to be correlated at 0.63, which means that a substantial value of the variance (nearly 40%) in one is explained by the other. Therefore, further normative commitment conceptualization and scale development and validation are needed (Bergman, 2006).

As reflected in the organizational commitment definition, this concept makes reference to a binding force that induces behaviour. Both Mathieu and Zajac (1990)’s meta-analysis and Meyer et al. (2002)’s subsequent research examined the most significant extant empirical research that explored and tested the consequences of organizational commitment. Among these consequences, it is important to highlight the extant literature related to employees’ turnover (Gellatly, Meyer, and Luchak, 2006; Luchak and Gellatly, 2007; Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982b) and/or turnover cognitions/intention to leave, which has been analyzed as a proxy. Moreover, absenteeism (Mowday et al., 1982b), job performance (Becker, Billings, Eveleth, and Gilbert, 1996; Meyer et al., 1989; Somers and Birnbaum, 1998), organizational citizenship behavior (Gellatly et al., 2006; Shore and Wayne, 1993), employee’s health and well-being (Begley and Czajka, 1993; Reilly, 1994; Siu, 2003), or employee lateness (Koslowsky, Sagie, Krausz, and Singer, 1997) have also been identified as salient consequences of employees’ organizational commitment.

Meyer et al.’s (2002) meta-analysis reveals that organizational commitment is related to three antecedent categories: personal variables (e.g., age, gender, education, organizational tenure), job and role characteristics (role conflict, role ambiguity, level of autonomy, job level, career mobility) and structural factors (social involvement, personal importance and formalization). Various authors have examined

the effects of these antecedent categories upon affective, continuance and normative commitment, revealing valuable implications for human resource practices (Smeenk et al., 2006). Nevertheless, little research has examined the influence of protean and boundaryless career attitudes upon organizational commitment.

***Protean and boundaryless career attitudes and organizational commitment:
Where is the link?***

Drawing on the regulatory focus theory, this section attempts to tackle the existence of a potential relationship between boundaryless and protean career attitudes and organizational commitment. Regulatory focus theory proposes that self-regulation in relation with strong ideals (i.e. what one wants to be) versus strong oughts (i.e. what other think one should be) differs in regulatory focus. Ideal self-regulation involves a promotion focus, concerned with advancement, growth and accomplishments, whereas ought self-regulation involves a prevention focus, concerned with security and safety (Higgins, 1998).

Moreover, regulatory focus influences individuals' perceptions about their goals and the implications this has for goal-oriented behaviour (Meyer, Becker, and Vandenberghe, 2004). Individuals with a promotion focus see themselves as working towards the attainment of their ideals, thus experiencing eagerness to attain advances and gains. On the contrary, individuals with a prevention focus are attempting to fulfil their obligations, and consequently they experience a state of vigilance to assure safety and non-losses. Therefore, Higgins (1998) argued that individuals with a strong prevention focus seek to satisfy minimum requirements for fulfilment, whereas those with a promotion focus seek to achieve the maximum level of accomplishment. In addition, building on the self-determination theory (Ryan and Deci, 2000), Meyer et al. (2004) proposed that on the one hand, employees with a promotion focus view their behaviour as more internally driven, experiencing intrinsic, identified and integrated regulation. On the other hand, those experiencing a prevention focus perceive their behaviour as more externally driven (external or introjected regulation).

Building on the concept of self-regulation and regulatory focus theory, Meyer et al. (2004) suggested that commitment should exert a direct effect on goal regulation, and the different forms of commitment should have a significant impact on the corresponding forms of regulation. Subsequently, they argued that employees with a stronger affective commitment (AC) experience grater intrinsic motivation, more autonomous forms of external regulation and a stronger promotion focus.

Individuals who are self-directed in adapting to the performance and learning demands of their careers perceive their behaviour as internally driven, reflecting "the inherent tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise their capacities, to explore and to learn" (Ryan and Deci, 2000: 70). Moreover, they are expected to exhibit a promotion focus, as they proactively manage their career

development and thus see themselves as working toward the attainment of their ideals. Therefore, a self-directed attitude in career management is expected to be positively related with affective commitment.

The mindset associated with continuance commitment (CC) is very different from the psychological state associated with AC. CC was described as a cost-based form of commitment that is based on one's belief that leaving the relationship would incur high personal sacrifices and / or available alternatives are limited or inexistent (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Instead of being motivated by a desire to remain, employees with higher levels of CC stay in order to minimize losses; in effect they stay because they believe they have little choice. Meyer et al. (2004) proposed that individuals with stronger continuance commitment experience greater external regulation (feel that their choices are controlled) and a stronger prevention focus. In the light of these considerations, we expect that:

H1: There is a positive relationship between self-direction in career management and affective commitment.

H2: There is a negative relationship between self-direction in career management and continuance commitment.

With regard to values-driven predispositions, we expect that a person who is not very clear on his or her values is more inclined to accept and adopt organizational values and for this reason he or she might be likely to develop affective bonds with the employing organization or in other words, he or she is expected to experience moderated to high levels of affective commitment. In addition, based on the regulatory focus theory, it can be asserted that high values-driven individuals experience greater external regulation and a stronger promotion focus, as they perceive themselves as working towards the attainment of their ideals. Therefore, we expect that:

H3: There is a positive relationship between values-driven predispositions and affective commitment.

H4: There is a negative relationship between values-driven predispositions and continuance commitment.

A boundaryless mindset is described as an opening attitude to the exterior, involving comfortableness and enthusiasm about creating and sustaining active relationships across organizational boundaries. It refers to enjoying job assignments that require working with people beyond the department or outside the organization, but also to a general attitude of feeling energized in new experiences and situations (Briscoe et al., 2006). By promoting and sustaining active relationships with people from different departments of the organization, individuals are likely to develop

affective bonds with employees within the same organization, as they create extensive internal networks. Nevertheless, this openness to the exterior may help those uncovering assorted options (Briscoe et al., 2006). Based on these considerations, we expect that:

H5: There is a positive relationship between holding a boundaryless mindset and affective commitment.

H6: There is a negative relationship between holding a boundaryless mindset and continuance commitment

The second boundaryless career attitude makes reference to the inclination of the individual towards physical mobility. In that sense, organizational mobility preference describes individual's strength of interest of remaining with a single or multiple employer(s). A person high on such an organizational mobility attitude "would be comfortable with or even prefer a career played out across several employers" (Briscoe et al., 2006: 31). Individuals experiencing organizational mobility preference are not inclined towards the predictability that comes with working continuously for the same organization and do not prefer to stay in a company they are familiar with instead of looking for employment opportunities elsewhere (Briscoe et al., 2006). Therefore, they are not expected to experience continuance commitment that primarily rises out of necessity, due to side-bets or to the perceived scarcity of available opportunities elsewhere. Similarly, individuals with a low preference towards organizational mobility are more risk-adverse and likely to experience a strong prevention focus, focused on security and safety, which is positively related with high continuance commitment (Meyer et al., 2004). Their predisposition to boundary-crossing may prevent these individuals to develop affective bonds with their current organization, and therefore we expect that:

H7: There is a negative relationship between organizational mobility preference and affective commitment.

H8: There is a negative relationship between organizational mobility preference and continuance commitment.

Method

Sample

Research data were collected using a web-based survey. The questionnaire was sent to 434 graduate and post-graduate distance learning students. An introductory letter of invitation was sent by email to the study participants. This invitation letter explained the purpose and significance of the study, emphasized voluntary participation and anonymity, and provided a hyperlink that took the participants to the survey website. The participants were asked to visit the survey website to fill out the questionnaire. Some days later, a postcard reminder was sent to

the emailing addresses of the participants. The postcard reminded potential participants of the survey and encouraged them to participate in the study by using the hyperlink provided in the postcard reminder. Finally, 167 surveys were submitted by the respondents, representing a response rate of 38.48%.

The respondents (59.28% women and 40.72% men) were anonymous and they were employed at the time the study was conducted, as the questionnaire items were related to their current employment experience. The average age of the respondents was 31.22 years old ($SD=7.27$). As regards the organizational size, most of them (44.31%) were working for small companies, whereas only a 12.57% were working in middle size companies and a significant percentage (43.11%) were employees of large companies. The average professional experience was 9.95 years ($SD = 6.77$), with an average organizational tenure of 5.20 years ($SD=5.38$). As regards the organizational size, most of them (44.32%) were working for small companies, whereas a significant percentage (43.11%) were employees of large companies and only a 12.57% were working in middle size companies. The highest level of education completed was a PhD (4.79%), while a 39.52% had completed a Bachelor's degree or a superior degree in engineering. The majority of the respondents had completed pre-university studies (55.69%).

Measures

Protean career attitudes (self-direction in career management and values-driven predispositions) were measured using Briscoe et al. (2006)'s 8-item scale (sample item: *"I am responsible for my success or failure in my career"*) and 6-item scale respectively (sample item: *"I navigate my own career based on my personal priorities, as opposed to my employer's priorities"*). As far as boundaryless career attitudes are concerned, they were also assessed based on Briscoe et al. (2006)'s measures, as follows: an 8-item scale was used to assess boundaryless mindset (sample item: *"I seek job assignments that allow me to learn something new"*) and a 5-item scale to measure organizational mobility preference (sample item: *"I like the predictability that comes from working continuously for the same organization"*).

The two organizational commitment mindsets that were chosen as the focus of this study were measured using Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993)'s 6-items affective commitment (α : 0.904; sample item: *"This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me"*) and respectively continuance commitment scales (α : 0.809; sample item: *"Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire"*).

Information on demographic and background characteristics was collected to gain a deeper understanding of the composition of the sample. Demographic and background characteristics that were considered relevant to the present study

included: age, gender, education level, years of professional experience, organizational tenure, and total number of employing organizations.

Procedure

Data of this research was collected by means of a questionnaire sent to the sample study. As mentioned above, the original questionnaire items were constructed in English. Because the general language of the target population was Spanish, the questionnaire had to be translated into this language. To ensure the accuracy of the translation, we followed a translation, back-translation procedure (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Moreover, five cognitive interviews were conducted in order to ensure an accurate interpretation of the questionnaire items, as this technique allows understanding how respondents perceive and interpret questions, and to identify potential problems that may arise in prospective survey questionnaires (Drennan, 2003). Cognitive interviews permitted us interpreting which items are beyond the theoretical framework of the constructs to be analyzed (Collins, 2003; Jobe and Mingay, 1989). By means of verbal probing and thinking aloud (Drennan, 2003; Williamson, Ranyard, and Cuthbert, 2000) participants were asked to verbalize their interpretation of items and to paraphrase and/or comment on the wording of items in an effort to identify ambiguous or poorly worded questions. Once collected the data, they were processed following Miles and Huberman (1994)'s suggestions. More specifically, the interviewees were asked to comment on the clarity and readability of the each item by asserting why they assessed it with a certain punctuation, and which parts of the items they found difficult to answer or interpret. Based on their comments minor stylistic and semantic changes were made.

Results

Test of reliability and validity

Internal consistency was measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient and our research results support Briscoe et al. (2006)'s reported coefficients. The reliability analysis yielded alpha coefficients higher than 0.70. The underlying dimensions of protean (e.g. self-directed attitudes scale, $\alpha=0.77$ and the values-driven one, $\alpha=0.76$) and boundaryless career attitudes (boundaryless mindset, $\alpha=0.86$ and organizational mobility preference $\alpha=0.74$) yielded to similar internal consistencies as those reported by Briscoe et al. (2006) (namely: 0.81, 0.69, 0.89 and 0.75 respectively).

Finally, we performed reliability analysis for the two organizational commitment components selected, affective and continuance commitment, which both produced Alpha coefficients higher than .70. More specifically, the affective commitment scale reported an alpha coefficient of .91, while the continuance commitment scale produced an alpha coefficient of 0.75. These results are consistent with previous with those obtained in a large diversity of studies, which reported

internal consistencies comprised between 0.70 and 0.90 (Gellatly et al., 2006; Luchak and Gellatly, 2007; Powell and Meyer, 2004; Somers, 1995).

Regression analyses

The hypothesized relationships between the underlying dimensions of boundaryless (boundaryless mindset and organizational mobility preference) and protean (self-direction and values driven) career attitudes were tested by means of hierarchical regression analysis. Checks of the theoretical assumptions underlying multiple regression were undertaken, including normality, linearity, and homoskedasticity. These assumptions were met and indeed and hence it can be asserted that multiple regression is quite robust to any violations (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996). Table 1 below presents the means, standard deviations, and Pearson's correlation coefficients between the variables in this study. As evident in Table 1, none of the independent variables considered in the regression models were correlated above .70, suggesting an absence of multicollinearity. The fact that none of the tolerance levels were found to be less than .1 and, therefore, that all of the variance inflation factors (VIF) were less than 10, provided additional evidence that the variables were not collinear (Pallant, 2001).

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Hypothesized relationships were tested using the hierarchical regression analysis. To compute the extent of additional variance explained by study variables, the regression analysis was performed by entering the control variables (demographic variables) in step 1, and protean and boundaryless career attitudes in step 2. Importance of embracing protean and boundaryless career attitudes in explaining affective and continuance commitment success can be demonstrated by examining the changes in R^2 from step to step (Table 2).

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The first regression models were conducted in order to test the consequences of embracing protean and boundaryless career attitudes upon employees' affective commitment to their current companies (see Table 2).

Hypothesis 1 proposed that there will be a positive relation between self-direction in career management and individuals' affective commitment to their employing organizations. The β coefficient for self-direction is positive and statistically significant ($\beta=0.19$, $p<0.05$). Accordingly, the data for this study indicate

that self-direction in career management contributes positively to psychological career success. Therefore, hypothesis 1 is supported.

Hypothesis 3 predicted a positive relationship between values-driven predispositions and affective commitment, in the light of the regulatory focus theory. Nevertheless, the regression analysis presented in Table 2 illustrates that the β coefficient for values-driven is negative and statistically significant ($\beta=-0.20$, $p<0.05$), reflecting that strong values driven predispositions contribute negatively to experiencing affective commitment. Hence, hypothesis 3 does not receive support for this study.

Hypotheses 5 and 7 highlighted predicted relationships between boundaryless career attitudes and individuals' affective commitment. Regression analyses conducted to shed more light on these relationships reflect that the relation between boundaryless mindset and affective commitment is not significant ($\beta=0.12$, ns), while organizational mobility preference is negatively related to the same outcome ($\beta=-0.36$, $p<0.001$). Therefore, hypothesis 5 was rejected and hypothesis 7 received full support.

Finally, regression analysis was conducted to explore the direct relationship between embracing protean and boundaryless career attitudes and individuals' continuance commitment to their employing organizations. Continuance commitment was first regressed on the control variables (demographic variables) followed by the four career attitudes in Step 2. The results are shown in Table 2.

The results indicate that continuance commitment had significant relationships with organizational mobility preference ($\beta=-0.50$, $p<0.001$) and marginally significant with boundaryless mindset ($\beta=0.15$, $p<0.1$) and values-driven predispositions ($\beta=-0.14$, $p<0.1$). The relationship between self-direction in career management and the cost-avoidance commitment mindset was not significant. Therefore, H8 received full support, H4 and H6 received partial support and H2 was not supported.

Changes in R^2 from Model 1 to Model 2 illustrate how much additional variance in affective and continuance commitment was explained by protean and boundaryless career attitudes ($\Delta R^2=0.17$, for affective commitment and $\Delta R^2=0.24$, for continuance commitment). Thus, the addition of career attitudes significantly explained more than 16% of affective and continuance commitment beyond what demographic variables explained.

Discussion and conclusions

The present study attempted to provide an insight upon the influence of boundaryless and protean career attitudes upon behavioural outcomes, and more

specifically upon individuals' commitment to their employing organizations, as to date there has been little theoretical and empirical research testing proposed links.

As organizations move forward into a boundaryless environment, the ability to attract, engage, develop and retain talent will become increasingly important (Somaya and Williamson, 2008). Changes from transactional to transformational psychological contract highlight that individuals are now a less malleable resource for the organization and more active investors of their personal human capital (Gratton and Ghoshal, 2003), for enhancing opportunities for continuous learning, that will further ensure their future marketability. In a context in which employees perceive organizations as mere vehicles for their careers, we consider that an examination of the relation between new career orientations and organizational commitment is timely, as it provides novel insights for individuals and organizations and sheds more light upon labour relationships.

Research findings highlight the salience of protean and boundaryless career attitudes for individuals' affective commitment to their employing organizations. More specifically, self-direction in managing one's own career and vocational development contributes positively and significantly to individuals' emotional attachment to their organizations. As explained in the theoretical framework, self-reliance and proactivity in managing one's career and vocational destiny reflect a promotion focus, concerned with advancement, growth and accomplishment of maximum job requirements and associated with high affective commitment.

Furthermore, we have found a negative relationship between values-driven predispositions and affective commitment that determines the rejection of the hypothesis 3, albeit in the theoretical framework, we predicted a positive relationship between these two variables. This assertion was rooted on the consideration that a person who is not very clear on his or her values is more inclined to accept and adopt organizational values and for this reason he or she might be likely to develop affective bonds with the employing organization. Nevertheless, given the situation of an individual high on values-driven predispositions, it might be argued that the degree in which he or she experiences affective commitment depends on the extent to which his or her personal values match organizational values. Therefore, it seems that values-driven mindset per se cannot be directly related with affective commitment, as this relationship depends upon situational/contingent factors. However, it can be argued that a values-driven individual, who finds his or her ideal place in which to fulfil those values, is likely to develop a strong sense of "belonging" to the organization, and therefore, is expected to experience high affective commitment. Thus, the negative relationship between values driven predispositions and affective commitment, might be explained through the lack of value fit between individual values and organizational ones. Hence, future research is encouraged for examining the moderating effect of values-match upon the relationship between values-driven predispositions and affective commitment.

With respect to organizational mobility preference, research results illustrate a negative and statistically significant relationship with affective commitment, hence supporting hypothesis 7. Individuals inclined towards crossing organizational boundaries are not expected to create affective bonds with their employing organization, due to their high preference for physical mobility.

With regard to continuance commitment, our research findings illustrate that organizational mobility preference is significant in predicting the commitment mindset associated with the perceived cost of leaving the organization. Organizational mobility preference was found to be negatively related to continuance commitment, as already predicted by the theoretical framework and the hypothesized links. This attitude makes reference to an individual's inclination towards physically crossing organizational boundaries, which may uncover him or her assorted options, which reduces the perceived scarcity of available alternatives on the external market.

Contrary to our expectations, boundaryless mindset ($\beta=0.164$, $p<0.1$) was found to be positively related with continuance commitment. Boundaryless mindset reflects openness to the exterior and individuals holding this attitude are feeling comfortable or even enthusiastic in promoting active relationships with people from different organizations, or located beyond one's current department. The relationship between boundaryless mindset and continuance commitment could be moderated by the extent to which individuals succeed in enhancing their social capital, which would in turn provide them access to the resources and the information other people possess and therefore help them discover different opportunities beyond organizational boundaries. In that sense, the relationship between holding a boundaryless mindset and continuance commitment would be negative if an individual's approach to creating and sustaining active relationships across organizational boundaries led to the enhancement of his or her internal and external networks. The moderating role of social capital in reducing continuance commitment represents an interesting future research line, which could bring a greater insight into the nature of this relationship. The relation between values driven and continuance commitment was found to be negative, suggesting that strong values driven predispositions reflect a promotion focus, which negatively affects one's commitment associated with the perceived cost of leaving.

There are several methodological limitations of the current study. First, cross-sectional correlational designs impede conclusive inferences regarding causal relationships among the study variables. Thus, statements regarding causal relationships need to be interpreted with caution. In order to overcome this limitation, future research should use longitudinal designs that permit more pertinent conclusions regarding the causal direction of the observed relationships. Second, the use of a sample of professionals attending distance learning business courses could limit the generalizability of the study findings, as the majority of the respondents were

homogenous in terms of age and educational background. Therefore, future research might seek samples that are more heterogenous on these characteristics. Furthermore, as reflected in the study findings future research should examine the role social capital and values fit may play upon the hypothesized relationships. Although the research findings suggest that these constructs may act as moderators in the hypothesized links, we believe that future research is needed for confirming these assertions. Finally, further research might expand the study to examine the relationship between protean and boundaryless career attitudes and work-related attitudes and behaviours (e.g. job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviour, turnover, etc), that were found to be salient consequences of experiencing organizational commitment.

This study has several implications for organizations. The changes in the external environment of organizations not only affected the nature of the labour force, but they also place important changes for human management practices, that will need to overcome its bureaucratic past and adopt new roles for assisting employees in career management and development. Organizational career management is a complex issue, and a common concern in the organizational career management literature is whether providing career management interventions for employees determines them to be more committed to the organization, or whether in contrast, it equips them to leave (Ito and Brotheridge, 2005; Sturges, Conway, and Liefooghe, 2005; Sturges, Guest, Conway, and Davey, 2002). Sturges et al. (2005) have argued that if organizations facilitate career self-management, the outcomes tend to be more commitment and less turnover. Our research findings are consistent with these assertions, at least with respect to affective commitment. The relationship between self-direction and continuance commitment was not statistically significant; nevertheless, it is affective commitment that has been most often related with low organizational turnover. Thus, the research findings suggest that if organizations help their employees in career management, employees may become more committed to their employing organizations, because they perceive organization values and support them. Self-direction is particularly relevant in today's organizations, which are increasingly decentralized, in a context that underlines a strong demand for innovation, and characterised by a greater than ever operational uncertainty. It has been found that self-direction is not an innate trait, but rather a malleable competence which can be improved in a sustainable way (Verbruggen and Sels, 2008). In order to promote self-direction companies could organize workshops addressing the importance of pursuing self-set goals in contrast to assigned goals, persisting in reaching one's goal, anticipating problems and opportunities, and developing skills and competences in the current job (Agut, Peiró and Grau, 2009). Moreover, promoting self-organizing teams and job redesign are specific strategies, directed to making employees more active regarding their work situation (Frese and Fay, 2001), for enhancing their affective commitment. Self-direction and personal initiative can also be fostered designing work structures, leader behaviours, and work climates that foster employees' confidence, activate challenging goals, and promote positive affect (Bindl and Parker, 2010).

Strong values driven predispositions were found to be negatively related with both affective and continuance commitment, reinforcing the importance of finding a strong values fit between organizational and individual values for fostering and increasing individuals' commitment to their employing organizations. Workshops oriented at clarifying and communicating organizational values, philosophy and principles can be all beneficial for strengthening employees' commitment to the organization. Human resources managers could also promote socialization tactics for new hires to ensure greater person-organization fit and organizational acceptance (Cable and Parsons, 2001).

Individuals' preference towards inter-organizational mobility was found to contribute negatively to both commitment mindsets approached in this study. Practicing managers and organizational researchers argued that fostering organizational commitment is highly desirable and beneficial for organization (Shore, Barksdale, and Shore, 1995). Employees with stronger commitment have been found to have less voluntary absenteeism (Hackett, Bycio, and Hausdorf, 1994; Meyer et al., 1993; Somers, 1995), to work harder and perform better (e.g., Bashaw and Grant, 1994), and to exhibit increased extra-role or "citizenship" behaviours (e.g., Munene, 1995; Pearce, 1993). Previous research suggested that organizations that elicit high commitment from mobile workers tend to focus less on traditional rewards and compensation and more on aligning workers' different commitments, as for instance aligning career commitment and organizational commitment (Pittinsky and Shih, 2004). Future research should be devoted at examining how organizational commitment can be built and maintained through mobile workers, by re-examining the antecedents of affective and continuance commitment.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among Study Variables

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Age	31,22	7,27											
2. Gender	0,41	0,5	,36**										
3. Organizational size	1,99	0,94	,11	,35**									
4. Tenure	5,2	5,38	,64**	,30**	,19*								
5. Number of employing organizations	3,43	1,73	,12	,02	-.19*	-,18*							
6. Educational level	1,74	0,94	,25**	,27**	,13	,17*	,03						
7. Self-direction	32,51	4,25	,04	,04	-.21**	-.09	,22*	-,11					
8. Values-driven	21,6	4,01	,03	,02	-.01	,02	,10	-,01	,38**				
9. Boundaryless mindset	31,69	5,01	,08	,03	,10	-.05	,13	,00	,31**	,25**			
10. Organizational mobility preference	12,57	3,65	-.01	-.03	-.10	-.16*	,24**	,09	,12	,14	,33**		
11. Affective commitment	17,89	5,62	,12	,09	-.03	,16*	-.05	-,02	,11	-,14	-,00	-0,34**	
12. Continuance commitment	14,83	4,62	,20*	0,01	0,07	,24**	-0,12	-0,09	-0,04	-0,16	-0,04	-,50**	,52**

Table 2. Regression results

Independent variables	Standardized regression weights			
	Affective commitment		Continuance commitment	
	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>
Step 1				
Age	.05	.03	.16	.16
Gender	.07	.04	-.07	-.08
Organizational size	-.08	-.08	.04	.00
Tenure	.13	.12	.16	.10
No of employing organizations	-.05	.00	-.10	-.01
Education	-.06	.01	-.14	-.08
ΔR^2	.03		.09	
F	1.055		2.871*	
Step 2		.19*		.03
Self-direction		-.20*		-.14.
Values-driven		.12		.15.
Boundaryless mindset		-.36***		-.50***
Organizational mobility preference		.17		.24
		.20		.33
ΔR^2		3.864***		7.684***
R^2 total				
F				

Note: . p<.01; *p<.05, **p<.01; ***p<.001

References

- Ackah, C. and Heaton, N. (2004), "The Reality of "New" Careers for Men and for Women", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 28, No. 2-4, pp.141-158.
- Agut, S., Peiro, J.M., and Grau, R. (2009), "The effect of overeducation on job content innovation and career-enhancing strategies among young Spanish employees", *Journal of Career Development*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 159-182
- Arthur, M. B. and Rousseau, D. M. (1996), *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arthur, M. B., Inkson, K. and Pringle, J. K. (1999), *The new careers: Individual action and economic change*, Sage, London.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (1998), Persons in the Labour Force, Australia, Australian Bureau of Statistics Report No. 6220.0, ABS, Canberra.
- Baruch, Y. (1998), "The rise and fall of Organizational Commitment", *Human Systems Management*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp.135-143.
- Baruch, Y. (2004), *Managing careers: Theory and practice*, Prentice Hall, Harlow, UK.
- Baruch, Y. (1999) "Integrated career systems for the 2000s", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp.432 - 457
- Bashaw, E.R. and Grant, S.E. (1994), "Exploring the distinctive nature of work commitments: their relationships with personal characteristics, job performance, and propensity to leave", *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 41-56.
- Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M. and Gilbert, N. L. (1996), Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 464-482.
- Begley, T. M. and Czajka, J. M. (1993), "Panel analysis of the moderating effects of commitment on job-satisfaction, intent to quit, and health following organizational-change", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, No. 4, pp.552-556.
- Bell, N. E. and Staw, B. M. (1989), "People as sculptors vs. sculpture: The role of personality and personal control in organizations", in Arthur, M. B., Hall, D. T., and Lawrence, B. S. (Eds), *Handbook of career theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 232-351
- Bergman, M. E. (2006), "The relationship between affective and normative commitment: review and research agenda", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27, No. 5, pp. 645-663.
- Bindl, U. K., and Parker, S. K. (2010). Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change-oriented action in organizations. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, Vol. 2, pp. 567-598.
- Bridges, W. (1995), *Job Shift. How to Prosper in a Workplace without Jobs*, Nicholas Brearley, London.
- Briscoe, J. P., Hall, D. T. and DeMuth, R. L. F. (2006). Protean and boundaryless careers: An empirical exploration, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 69 No.1, pp. 30-47.
- Cable, D. M., and Parsons, C. K. (2001). Socialization tactics and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 54, pp. 1-23.

- Cappelli, P. (1999), "Career Jobs are Dead," *California Management Review*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 146-167
- Collins, D. (2003), "Pretesting survey instruments: An overview of cognitive methods", *Quality of Life Research*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 229-238.
- Crant, J. M. (2000), "Proactive behavior in organizations", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 435-462.
- Dany, F. (2003), "Free Actors and Organizations: Critical Remarks about the New Career Literature, Based on French Insights", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 14, No.5, pp. 821-838.
- Drennan, J. (2003), "Cognitive interviewing: verbal data in the design and pretesting of questionnaires", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 57-63.
- Frese, M., and Fay, D. (2001), "Personal initiative (PI): An active performance concept for work in the 21st century", in Staw B. M. and Sutton R. M *Research in organizational behaviour*, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, pp. 133-187.
- Gellatly, I. R., Meyer, J. P., and Luchak, A. A. (2006), "Combined effects of the three commitment components on focal and discretionary behaviors: A test of Meyer and Herscovitch's propositions", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 69, No.2, pp. 331-345.
- Golzen, G., and Garner, G. (1990), *Smart Moves*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Gratton, L., and Ghoshal, S. (2003), "Managing Personal Human Capital: New Ethos for the "Volunteer" Employee", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 1-10.
- Guest, D.E. (2004), "Flexible Employment Contracts, the Psychological Contract and Employee Outcomes: An Analysis and Review of the Evidence," *International Journal of Management, Reviews*, Vol. 5/6, No. 1, pp. 1-19.
- Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P. and Hausdorf, P. A. (1994), "Further assessments of Meyer and Allen (1991) 3-component model of organizational commitment", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 79, No.1, pp. 15-23.
- Hall, D. T. (1976), *Careers in organizations*, Sage , Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hall, D. T. (2002), *Protean careers in and out of organizations*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hall, D. T. (2004), "The protean career: A quarter-century journey", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 65, No. 1, pp. 1-13.
- Hall, D. T. and Chandler, D. E. (2005), "Psychological success: When the career is a calling", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp.155-176.
- Handy, C. (1994), *The Empty Raincoat: Making sense of the future*, Hutchinson, London.
- Herriot, P. and Pemberton, C. (1995), "*New Deals: The Revolution in Managerial Careers*", John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, Sussex.
- Higgins, E. T. (1998), "Promotion and prevention: regulatory focus as a motivational principle", in *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Zanna M. P. (Ed), Vol. 30, Academic Press, New York, pp. 1-46.
- Ito, J. K. and Brotheridge, C. M. (2005), "Does supporting employees" career adaptability lead to commitment or turnover or both", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 44, pp. 5-19.
- Jobe, J. B. and Mingay, D. J. (1989), Cognitive research improves questionnaires, *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 79, No.8, pp.1053-1055.
- Jones, C. (1996), "Careers in Project Networks: The Case of the Film Industry," in Arthur, M. B and Rousseau, D. M. (Eds), *The Boundaryless Career: A New*

- Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era*, Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 58–75.
- King, Z. (2004), "Career Self-Management: Its Nature, Causes and Consequences," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 65, pp. 112–133.
- Koslowsky, M., Sagie, A., Krausz, M. and Singer, A. D. (1997), "Correlates of employee lateness: Some theoretical considerations", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82, No. 1, pp. 79-88.
- Levinson, D. (1978), *The seasons of a man's life*, Knopf, New York.
- Luchak, A. A. and Gellatly, I. R. (2007), "A comparison of linear and nonlinear relations between organizational commitment and work outcomes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, No. 3, pp.786-793.
- Mathieu, J. E. and Zajac, D. M. (1990), "A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 108, No.2, pp. 171-194.
- McKeown, T. (2003), "Commitment from a contractor workforce", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol, 24, No. 2, pp. 169-186
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. and Smith, C. A. (1993), "Commitment to organizations and occupations - Extension and test of a 3-component conceptualization", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, No. 4, pp. 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. and Topolnytsky, L. (1998), "Commitment in a changing world of work", *Canadian Psychology*, Vol. 39, pp. 83-93.
- Meyer, J. P. and Allen, N. J. (1991), "A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 1, pp. 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P. and Allen, N. J. (1997), *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Meyer, J. P. and Herscovitch, L. (2001), "Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 11, pp. 299-326.
- Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., and Vandenberghe, C. (2004), "Employee commitment and motivation: a conceptual analysis and integrative model", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89, No. 6, pp. 991-1007.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D. and Jackson, D. N. (1989), "Organizational commitment and job-performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 74, No.1, pp. 152-156.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L. and Topolnytsky, L. (2002), "Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 61, No.1, pp. 20-52.
- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. (1994), *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA.
- Mirvis, P. H. and Hall, D. T. (1996), Psychological success and the boundaryless career, in Arthur, M. B. and Rousseau, D. M. (Eds.), *The boundaryless career*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 237-256.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W. and Steers, R. M. (1982), *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*, Academic Press, New York.
- Munene, J. C. (1995), "Not on seat": An investigation of some correlates of organizational citizenship behavior in Nigeria", *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, Vol. 44, pp.111-222.

- Nunnally, J. C. and Bernstein, I. H. (1994), *Psychometric Theory*, McGraw Hill, New York.
- Pallant, J. (2001), *SPSS Survival Manual*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
- Pang, M. (2003), "Boundaryless Careers? The (In-)Voluntary (Re-)Actions of Some Chinese in Hong Kong and Britain", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 14, No. 5, pp. 809-820.
- Pearce, J. L. (1993), "Towards an organizational behavior of contract laborers: Their psychological involvement and effects on employee coworkers", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 36, pp. 1082-1096.
- Pittinsky, T. L. and Shih, M. J. (2004), "Knowledge nomads - Organizational commitment and worker mobility in positive perspective", *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 47, No. 6, pp. 791-807.
- Powell, D. M. and Meyer, J. P. (2004), "Side-bet theory and the three-component model of organizational commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 65, No. 1, pp. 157-177.
- Pringle, J. K. and Mallon, M. (2003), "Challenges for the Boundaryless Career Odyssey", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 14, No. 5, pp. 839-853.
- Reilly, N. P. (1994), "Exploring a paradox - Commitment as a moderator of the stressor burnout relationship", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 397-414.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989), "Psychological and implied contracts in organizations", *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 121-139.
- Rousseau, D. M. and Wade-Benzoni, K. A. (1995), "Changing individual-organization attachments: A two way street", in Howard, A (Ed.), *Changing nature of work*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp.290-321.
- Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2000), "Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 68-78.
- Saxenian, A. L. (1996), "Beyond boundaries: Open labor markets and learning in Silicon Valley", in Arthur, M. B. and Rousseau, D. M. (Eds.), *The boundaryless career*, Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 23-39.
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L. and Crant, J. M. (2001), "What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 54, No. 4, pp. 845-874.
- Shore, L. M. and Wayne, S. J. (1993), "Commitment and employee behavior - Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, No. 5, pp. 774-780.
- Shore, L. M., Barksdale, K. and Shore, T. H. (1995), "Managerial perceptions of employee commitment to the organization", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.38, No. 6, pp. 1593-1615.
- Siu, O. L. (2003), "Job stress and job performance among employees in Hong Kong: The role of Chinese work values and organizational commitment", *International Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 38, No. 6, pp. 337-347.
- Smeenk, S.G.A., Eisinga, R.N., Teelken, J.C. and Doorewaard, J. (2006), "The effects of HRM practices and antecedents on organizational commitment among university employees", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 2035-2054.

- Somaya, D. and Williamson, I. O. (2008). Rethinking the “war for talent”, *Mit Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 29-34.
- Somers, M. J. (1995), “Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 49-58.
- Somers, M. J. and Birnbaum, D. (1998), “Work-related commitment and job performance: it’s also the nature of the performance that counts”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 19, No. 6, pp. 621-634.
- Sturges, J., Conway, N., Guest, D. and Liefoghe, A. (2005), “Managing the career deal: the psychological contract as a framework for understanding career management, organizational commitment and work behaviour”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 26, pp. 821-838.
- Sturges, J., Guest, D., Conway, N. and Davey, K. M. (2002), “A longitudinal study of the relationship between career management and organizational commitment among graduates in the first ten years at work”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23, No. 6, pp. 731-748.
- Sullivan, S. E. (1999), “The changing nature of careers: A review and research agenda”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 25, No.3, pp. 457-484.
- Sullivan, S. E. and Arthur, M. B. (2006), “The evolution of the boundaryless career concept: Examining physical and psychological mobility”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 69, No. 1, pp. 19-29.
- Super, D. (1957), *Psychology of careers*, Harper and Brothers, New York.
- Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S. (1996), *Using multivariate statistics*, Harper Collins, New York.
- Verbruggen, M. and Sels, L. (2008), “Can career self-directedness be improved through counseling?”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 73, No.2, pp.318-327.
- Waterman, R. H., Waterman, J. A. and Collard, B. A. (1994), “Towards the career resilient workforce”, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. July-August, pp.87-95.
- Williamson, J., Ranyard, R. and Cuthbert, L. (2000), “A conversation-based process tracing method for use with naturalistic decisions: An evaluation study”, *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 91, pp. 203-221.
- Zeitz, G., Blau, G. and Fertig, J. (2009), “Boundaryless careers and institutional resource”, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 20, No.2, pp. 372-398